

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Official Action mailed June 1, 2005. In order to advance prosecution of the present Application, Claim 16 has been amended. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and favorable action in this Application.

Claims 1-10 and 16-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Ambe, et al. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Independent Claims 1 and 21 recites in general an ability to determine whether the outbound port has been identified for intercept processing, determine whether the destination has been identified for intercept processing in response to the port being identified for intercept processing, and make a copy of the information packet in response to the destination being identified for intercept processing. By contrast, the Ambe, et al. patent sends a packet to a mirrored to port when an ingress or egress port is to be mirrored. The Ambe, et al. patent does not use the destination of a packet in determining whether the packet is to be sent to a mirrored to port. Thus, the Ambe, et al. patent does not copy a packet after a determination that both an output port and a destination for the packet have been identified for intercept processing as required by the claimed invention.

Independent Claim 16 recites ". . . the plurality of processing columns operable to determine whether the source and the destination are identified for intercept processing, the plurality of processing columns operable to build a copy of the packet in response to either of the source or the destination for the information packet being identified for intercept processing . . ." By contrast, the Ambe, et al. patent merely performs mirroring on an ingress port and/or egress port basis. Thus, the Ambe, et al. patent does not

perform mirroring based on a source or a destination for the packet as provided by the claimed invention.

As shown above, Independent Claims 1, 16, and 21 have features not disclosed in the Ambe, et al. patent. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1-10 and 16-21 are not anticipated by the Ambe, et al. patent.

Applicant notes with appreciation the allowance of Claims 11-15.

CONCLUSION

Applicant has made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons, and for other apparent reasons, Applicants respectfully request full allowance of all pending claims.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.

Attorneys for Applicants



Charles S. Fish

Reg. No. 35,870

September 1, 2005

CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:

2001 Ross Avenue, Suite 600
Dallas, TX 75201-2980
(214) 953-6507
Customer Number: 05073